



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/634,546	08/05/2003	Kim Annon Ryal	SNY-T5574	6035

24337 7590 01/11/2007
MILLER PATENT SERVICES
2500 DOCKERY LANE
RALEIGH, NC 27606

EXAMINER

CHU, RANDOLPH I

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2624

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/11/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/634,546

Applicant(s)

RYAL ET AL.

Examiner

Randolph Chu

Art Unit

2624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 8/5/2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: In paragraph [0036], "columns 1, J and K" should be "columns L, J and K". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
3. Claims 1 - 3, 6, 7, 8, 10-13, 16, 17, 22-25, 28-35 and 38-40 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katayama et al. (US 2002/0126890) in view of Milic-Frayling et al. (US 2004/0100510).

With respect claim 1, Katayama et al. teaches providing a first and a second image, wherein the first and second images overlap one another; removing a portion of the first image; removing a portion of the second image; wherein, a composite image comprising the remainder of the first image displayed adjacent the remainder of the second image provides a selected view extracted from a total scene captured in the sum of the first and second images (Fig. 3).

Katayama et al. does not disclose expressly that presenting a main window; presenting a secondary window adjacent the main window; first and second images overlap one another by at least 50%; displaying a remainder of the first image in the main window; displaying a remainder of the second image in the secondary window.

Milic-Frayling et al. teaches presenting a main window; presenting a secondary window adjacent the main window; displaying a remainder of the first image in the main window; displaying a remainder of the second image in the secondary window (Fig. 1).

Katayama et al. and Milic-Frayling et al. are analogous art because they are in the "same field of endeavor", image/graphic processing.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to display composite image from plurality digital images into multiple windows in the method of Katayama et al.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that displaying two different adjacent images into multiple windows to make panoramic image effect. Further, there is no disclosed criticality of image overlapping one another by at least 50% or opposed to any other value.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Milic-Frayling et al. with Katayama et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

With respect to claim 2, Katayama et al. teaches the first and second image are taken by multiple camera angles from a single camera location (Fig. 13).

With respect to claim 3, Milic-Frayling et al. teaches the composite image is displayed on a television display, and wherein the secondary window comprises a picture-in-picture window (Fig 1, Fig 15).

With respect to claim 6, Milic-Frayling et al. teaches receiving a command to pan the view; identifying portions of the first and second images to remove in order to create the remainder of the first image and the remainder of the second image to produce the panned view; removing the identified portions of the first and second images to create the remainder of the first image and the remainder of the second image to produce the panned view; and displaying the panned view by displaying the remainder of the first image and the remainder of the second image in the main and secondary windows respectively (Fig. 1, para. 0033-0035).

With respect to claim 7, Milic-Frayling et al. teaches out in one of a DVD player, a personal computer system, a television set-top-box and a personal computer system (Fig 15).

4. Claims 4, 9, 14, 18, 21, 26, 36 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katayama et al. (US 2002/0126890) in view of Milic-Frayling et al. (US 2004/0100510) and in further view of Teshima (US 2001/0051007).

With respect to claim 4, Katayama et al. in view of Milic-Frayling et al. teaches all the limitations of claim 1 as applied above from which claim 4 respectively depends.

Katayama et al. in view of Milic-Frayling et al. does not teach expressly that the first and second images are identified within a transport stream by first and second packet identifiers respectively.

Teshima teaches identifying images within a transport stream by packet identifiers (para. 0140 and 0141).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to identify images within a transport stream by packet identifiers in the method of Katayama et al. in view of Milic-Frayling et al.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that images could be quickly identified without loading whole image.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Teshima with Katayama et al. in view of Milic-Frayling et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claim 4.

5. Claims 5, 15, 20, 27 and 37 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katayama et al. (US 2002/0126890) in view of Milic-Frayling et al. (US 2004/0100510) and in further view of Bohnenkamp (US 6,895,128).

With respect to claim 5, Katayama et al. in view of Milic-Frayling et al. teaches all the limitations of claim 1 as applied above from which claim 5 respectively depends.

Katayama et al. in view of Milic-Frayling et al. does not teach expressly that the first and second images are identified within a recorded medium by first and second packet identifiers respectively.

Bohnenkamp teaches identifying images within a recorded medium by packet identifiers (para. 0140 and 0141).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to identify images within a recorded medium by packet identifiers in the method of Katayama et al. in view of Milic-Frayling et al.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that images could be quickly identified without loading whole image.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Bohnenkamp with Katayama et al. in view of Milic-Frayling et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claim 5.

With respect to claim 8, please refer to rejection for claim 1.

With respect to claim 9, please refer to rejection for claims 1, 4 and 6.

With respect to claim 10, please refer to rejection for claim 1.

With respect to claim 11, please refer to rejection for claim 1.

With respect to claim 12, please refer to rejection for claim 2.

With respect to claim 13, please refer to rejection for claim 3.

With respect to claim 14, please refer to rejection for claim 4.

With respect to claim 15, please refer to rejection for claim 5.

With respect to claim 16, please refer to rejection for claim 6.

With respect to claim 17, please refer to rejection for claim 7.

With respect to claim 18, please refer to rejection for claims 1, 4 and 6.

With respect to claim 20, Bohnenkamp teaches storing images in the digital format (Fig. 9).

With respect to claim 21, Teshima teaches transmitting images in a digital transport stream (Fig. 1).

With respect to claim 22, please refer to rejection for claim 1.

With respect to claim 23, please refer to rejection for claim 1.

With respect to claim 24, please refer to rejection for claim 2.

With respect to claim 25, please refer to rejection for claim 3.

With respect to claim 26, please refer to rejection for claim 4.

With respect to claim 27, please refer to rejection for claim 5.

With respect to claim 28, please refer to rejection for claim 6.

With respect to claim 29, please refer to rejection for claim 7.

With respect to claim 30, please refer to rejection for claim 8.

With respect to claim 31, please refer to rejection for claim 1.

With respect to claim 32, Milic-Frayling et al. teaches selecting a size of windows (para. 0038 and 0069).

With respect to claim 33, please refer to rejection for claim 1.

With respect to claim 34, please refer to rejection for claim 2.

With respect to claim 35, please refer to rejection for claim 3.

With respect to claim 36, please refer to rejection for claim 4.

With respect to claim 37, please refer to rejection for claim 5.

With respect to claim 38, please refer to rejection for claim 6.

With respect to claim 39, please refer to rejection for claim 7.

With respect to claim 40, please refer to rejection for claim 8.

6. Claims 19 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katayama et al. (US 2002/0126890) in view of Milic-Frayling et al. (US 2004/0100510) in further view of Teshima (US 2001/0051007) and in further view of Driscoll, JR et al. (US 2004/0021764).

Katayama et al. in view of Milic-Frayling et al. and Teshima teaches all the limitations of claim 18 as applied above from which claim 19 respectively depends.

Katayama et al. in view of Milic-Frayling et al. and Teshima does not teach expressly that the digital format comprises an MPEG compliant format.

Driscoll, JR et al. teaches digital format comprises an MPEG compliant format. (para. 0064).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use MPEG format as digital format in the method of Katayama et al. in view of Milic-Frayling et al and Teshima.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that popular MPEG standard format can be used.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Driscoll, JR et al. with Katayama et al. in view of Milic-Frayling et al. and Teshima to obtain the invention as specified in claim 18.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Randolph Chu whose telephone number is 571-270-1145. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday from 7:30 am - 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Mancuso can be reached on 571-272-7695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RIC/



JOSEPH MANCUSO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Continuation of Attachment(s) 3). Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08), Paper No(s)/Mail Date :8/5/03, 9/2/03, 11/3/04, 3/15/05, 6/2/05, 7/29/05, 10/28/05, 1/30/06, 4/25/06, 7/24/06, 10/30/06.